

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/997,536	11/29/2001	Masaki Aoki	NAK1-AY33ara	7590
21611 7	590 12/22/2004		EXAMINER	
SNELL & WILMER LLP			KUNEMUND, ROBERT M	
1920 MAIN ST SUITE 1200	TREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
IRVINE, CA 92614-7230			1765	

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		/	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	-1
	09/997,536	AOKI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert M Kunemund	1765	
The MAILING DATE of this communica Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addres	s
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) di  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a cation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of thi ory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI by statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this commu BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on 04 October 2004		
	☐ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice	allowance except for formal mat		erits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 28,29,36 and 37 is/are pendin 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are solutions.  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☒ Claim(s) 28,29,36 and 37 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restrictions.	withdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a	)□ accepted or b)□ objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection	on to the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including th 11) The oath or declaration is objected to b			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority do 2. Certified copies of the priority do 3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the International	ocuments have been received. Incuments have been received in another the priority documents have been the large of the lar	Application No n received in this National Sta	ge
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	, <del>_</del>	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date	
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC3)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	- I	Informal Patent Application (PTO-152	2)

Art Unit: 1765

Newly added claims 30 and 31 have been renumbered to claims 36 and 37, see rule 126. New claims cannot have canceled numbers.

Also, the next amendment must be compliant and idicate the changes to the numbering in a proper manner.

The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective (see 37 CFR 1.175 and MPEP § 1414) because of the following:

The error set forth does not match the changes made to the claims. The error recites a need to add apparatus limitations to the method claims. However, the changes made to the claims recite apparatus only.

Claims 28, 29, 36 and 37 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue oath under 35 U.S.C. 251 as set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.175.

The nature of the defect(s) in the oath is set forth in the discussion above in this Office action.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

Art Unit: 1765

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 28, 29, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (Wo 96/32520)

The Lee et al reference teaches an apparatus for the deposition of oxide thin films including magnesium. In a chamber, an electron beam gun is placed and point at the substrate. The electron beam gun can then be used to grow magnesium oxide thin film, note page 5. The sole difference between the instant claims and the prior art the orientation of the grown layer. However, in the absence of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine through routine experimentation the optimum, operable orientation of the grown layer in the Lee et al reference as the orientation of the grown layer is a known result effective variable.

## Response to Applicants' Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed October 4, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' argument concerning the rejection over the oath is noted. However, the error indicates that there should be apparatus limitations added into method claims. What as been done in the application is to cancel the method and add only apparatus claims. This is not consistant with the error stated in the oath.

Art Unit: 1765

Applicants' argument concerning the Lee et al US patent 5,849,370 has been considered and not deemed persuasive. The examiner has not used this patent in the rejections of record. The teachings set forth in this patent are not the same as saet forth in the Lee et al reference applied by the examiner in the rejections, Thus, the arguments have no bearing on patentablity.

Applicants' argument concerning the Lee et al WO 96/32520 is noted. However, applicants arguments are based on column and line citations from the reference. The reference does not have these column and line citations. The arguments therefore are deemed moot as the basis cannot be found by the examiner.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1765

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Kunemund whose telephone number is 571-272-1464. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571-272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**RMK** 

ROBERT KUNEMUND PRIMARY EXAMINER